# A Modest Proposal 6:36

Advantage 1 is a personal narrative.

Seriously what’s the deal with waiters these days? I’m just trying to enjoy my meal when all of a sudden some obnoxious waiter comes by and obsequiously asks how I’m doing. “Fine,” I brush him off, trying to enjoy these unlimited soups and salads like I intended, but then he’s back. “How are you doing? Can I get anything for you?” Oh God. “FINE! I’M DOING FINE! LEAVE ME ALONE SO I CAN EAT MY BREADSTICKS!” All was quiet on the western front for a few more minutes, but then much like some possessed ghost demon cockroach who came back from the dead to haunt the very fibers of my existence, that waiter came back and I heard those harrowing words drip out of his lips: “I see we hated he meal, did we? Haha! Can I get you anything for dessert?” I clinched my fist. I furrowed my brow. I made my peace with being a free man—I was fully ready to murder this swarmy sycophant. But then I remembered Europe. I remember the vacation I went where the waiters weren’t paid by tips, and I remembered how happy he was, I was, how happy we were, not having to feign some sort of sincerity and caring and niceness for tips, as we both knew he made a fair wage paid by his employer. And then, in that Olive Garden, I came too. I realized my anger was not with this waiter, but with the system. And such was the day I devoted myself to reforming it—by whatever means possible.

If waiters make a living wage then they won’t have to bother me while I’m trying to finish my goddamn—excuse me, Bostromdamn—meal

Advantage 2—Thermo-nuclear-global-war-extinction-Bostrom.

Everyone already knows if we don’t raise the minimum wage a few dollars in this one specific sector for a select few employees, humanity will be destroyed like my chance of breaking with this plan. I don’t even really need evidence for this claim, ‘cause let’s be honest, nobody even flows the AC in the first place, but if I must…

Plan boosts the economy, prevents poverty, and raises wages for poor workers who need to support their families.

COOPER 13 [David Cooper, Economic analyst for the Economic Policy Institute with areas of expertise in poverty, state labor markets, economic inequality and social mobility, and the minimum wage, he has been interviewed and cited for his research on the minimum wage in The New York Times, The Washington Post, The Los Angeles Times, U.S. News and World Report, CNBC and NPR, he has a B.A. and M.P.P. from Georgetown University, published by the Economic Policy Institute (a nonpartisan and nonprofit think tank created in 1986 to include the needs of low and middle income workers in economic policy discussions, EPI conducts research and

This projected rise in consumer spending would provide a modest boost to U.S. GDP, even after accounting for the increased labor cost to businesses and the potential for small price increases for consumers. Using standard fiscal multipliers, we would expect that increasing the federal minimum wage from $7.25 to $10.10 would generate a net increase in economic activity of $22.1 billion over the phase-in period. This additional GDP would support roughly 85,000 new jobs.4 As shown in Appendix Table 1, increasing the federal minimum wage would generate jobs in every state. (As noted previously, detailed state- level demographic information on each state’s affected workers is available at [http://www.epi.org/files/2013/minimum-wage-state-tables.pdf.)](http://www.epi.org/files/2013/minimum-wage-state-tables.pdf) Appendix Table 2 details the economic effects of each of the three incremental increases.

Economic decline triggers lashout and global war---economic institutions won’t check, which answers impact D

The threat of systemic disruption generates a new sort of uncertainty, one that mirrors the decisive feature of the crisis of the summer of 1914. At that time, no one could really know whether clashes would escalate or not. That feature contrasts remarkably with almost the entirety of the Cold War, especially since the 1960s, when the strategic doctrine of M[AD]utually Assured Destruction left no doubt that any superpower conflict would inevitably escalate. The idea of network disruption relies on the ability to achieve advantage by surprise, and to win at no or low cost. But it is inevitably a gamble, and raises prospect that others might, but also might not be able to, mount the same sort of operation. Just as in 1914, there is an enhanced temptation to roll the dice, even though the game may be fatal.

And this great power war risks extinction

FREEMAN 9/13 [Chas W. Freehamn, served in the United States Foreign Service, the State and Defense Departments in many different capacities over the course of thirty years, past president of the Middle East Policy Council, co-chair of the U.S. China Policy Foundation and a Lifetime Director of the Atlantic Council, 9/13/14, “A New Set of Great Power Relationships,”]

This is, after all, the nuclear age. A war could end in the annihilation of all who take part in it. Short of that, unbridled animosity and contention between great powers and their allies and friends have high opportunity costs and foster the tensions inherent in military posturing, arms races, instability, and impoverishment.

Preventing extinction comes first, duh. Nobody cares that it’s improbable because a) it’s not, I have authors who are kinda making passing references to what I’m talking about, and these authors sorta suggest the possibility of extinction isn’t necessarily not going to happen and b) the probability of Firefly being cancelled was pretty low, and that was friggin’ awful. Whatever, this analysis means nothing. Bow to your god and savoir Nick Bostrom:

Nick Bostrom. Faculty of Philosophy and Oxford Martin School University of Oxford; Generally Crazy Person but not this argument because it’s actually pretty sane.“Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy (2012)

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest[s] an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be [is] confused. We may not now know— at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

Advantage 3 is some pomo card that I swear affirms, but I’m going to spread through it, having cut it so densely, you won’t be able to hear what it means or even know if it’s sensible or applicable to this topic. This means you flow it anyway, pretend to understand it during your RFD when my opponent calls you out, and evaluate it first under any framework because of time skew and neg win biases. Empirically verified because round 2 at novice NDCA last year had a 8% neg win bias. Neg bias means also aff gets presumption, AFC, an automatic win, and high speaker points. Delueze & Guattari

In point of fact, if desire is the lack of the real object, its very nature as a real entity depends upon an "essence of lack" that produces the fantasized object. Desire thus conceived of as production, though merely the production of fantasies, has been explained perfectly by psychoanalysis. On the very lowest level of interpretation, this means that the real object that desire lacks is related to an extrinsic natural or social production, whereas desire intrinsically produces an imaginary object that functions as a double of reality, as though there were a "dreamed-of object behind every real object," or a mental production asbehind all real productions. This conception does not necessarily compel psychoanalysis to engage in a study of gadgets and markets, in the form of an utterly dreary and dull psychoanalysis of the object: psychoanalytic studies of packages of noodles, cars, or "thingumajigs." But even when the fantasy is interpreted in depth, not simply as an object, but as a specific machine that brings desire itself front and center, this machine is merely theatrical, and the complementarity of what it sets apart still remains: it is now need that is defined in terms of a relative lack and determined by its own object, whereas desire is regarded as what produces the fantasy and produces itself by detaching itself from the object, though at the same time it intensifies the lack by making it absolute: an "incurable insufficiency of being," an "inability-to-be that is life itself." Hence the presentation of desire as something supported by needs, while these needs, and their relationship to the object as something that is lacking or missing, continue to be the basis of the productivity of desire (theory of an underlying support). In a word, when the theoretician reduces desiring-production to a production of fantasy, he is content to exploit to the fullest the idealist principle that defines desire as a lack, rather than a process of production, of "industrial" production. Clement Rosset puts it very well: every time the emphasis is put on a lack that desire supposedly suffers from as a way of defining its object, "the world acquires as its double some other sort of world, in accordance with the following line of argument: there is an object that desire feels the lack of; hence the world does not contain each and every object that exists; there is at least one object missing, the one that desire feels the lack of; hence there exists some other place that contains the key to desire (missing in this world)."29If desire produces, its product is real. If desire is productive, it can be productive only in the real world and can produce only reality. Desire is the set of passive synthes es that engineer partial objects, flows, and bodies, and that function as units of production. The real is the end product, the result of the passive syntheses of desire as autoproduction of the unconscious. Desire does not lack anything; it does not lack its object. It is, rather, the subject that is missing in desire, or desire that lacks a fixed subject; there is no fixed subject unless there is repression. Desire and its object are one and the same thing: the machine, as a machine of a machine.

As long as I have AFC, my standard is conceding to the affirmative. Whichever debater can concede that aff wins the most wins the round.

Thus I modestly propose the plan: The US ought to ensure employers pay a living wage to waiters and waitresses. Redditor lbreakjai clarifies with his response to AskReddit question “Non-americans of Reddit, what American customs seem outrageous/pointless to you?”

Lbreadkjai, 1/4/15 http://www.reddit.com/r/AskReddit/comments/2rb0pa/nonamericans\_of\_reddit\_what\_american\_customs\_seem/cne5ezw

**Tipping being considered mandatory. I know waiters don't get paid a lot and tipping represents a good part of their revenue. I just don't get why they don't get paid a decent living wage in the first place.**

Also prefer this because 1. He’s practically internet famous. Lbreakjai has 4900 link karma. For y’all who aren’t on reddit a) get on reddit, it’s awesome b) that’s a lot. 2. He has the objectivity of being outside the U.S. being able to accurately look in at our situation 3. A PRIORI ALERT! This affirms on face because the comment was gilded and received almost 4000 upvotes, which means the people want the plan.

# Framework—Irony Good

#### All kidding aside, let’s get serious, there was a method behind that madness. My AC mocks the charade we all play behind pretending what we talk about is significant. I really want to just talk about how a living wage means we don’t have to tip waiters, which means they won’t be as annoying, but then everyone complains about significance, expecting me to run some extinction scenario.

#### The role of your ballot is to vote for whomever best uses irony to deconstruct debate. My performance of the AC allows me to challenge the dominance of traditional politics.

Kulynych, Assistant Professor of Political Science @ Wintrop University, 1997 (Jessica Polity, vol. 30, #2 pg. 334-5)

If we interpret the “to show” here not as pointing out what is wrong with disciplinary society (which would leave Foucault subject to Fraser’s normative criticism), but rather as “showing,” or “showing up,” then we no longer need the introduction of normative notions, we are merely doing disciplinary society one better. Making a point is a function of discourse, the ability to align and arrange arguments that support a position. Yet, the performative protestor does not argue against the state, he mocks it. The protestor works at the margins of discourse, utilizing puns and jokes and caricature to “expose” the limits of what is being said. Thus, performative resistance, when considered as a critique, does not need to tell us what is wrong, rather it reveals the existence of subjection where we had not previously seen it. I am not suggesting that we can get a normative anchor out of the notion of performativity. To the contrary, I am suggesting performative resistance makes no such normative distinctions, or rather, that performativity is not about normative distinctions. We bring normativity to our performances as ethical principles that are themselves subject to resistance. By unearthing the contingency of the “self-evident,” performative resistance enables politics. Thus, the question is not should we resist (since resistance is always, already present), but rather what and how we should resist. This notion of performativity is also important for understanding the possibilities for innovation in Habermasian deliberative participation. Just as a protestor exposes the contingency of concepts like justive, a dialogue exposes the limits and contingency of rational argumentation. Once we are sensitive to the performative nature of speech, language and discourse, then we can see that deliberative politics cannot be confined to the rational statement of validity claims. Deliberation must be theatrical; it is in the performance of deliberation that that which cannot be argued for finds expression. Indeed it is precisely the non-rational aspects of deliberation that carry the potential for innovation. In his description of the poignant reminders of demonstration Chalounka recognizes that it is at the margins that the actual force of the demonstration resides, no matter what happens at the microphone. The oral histories of demonstrations (the next day over coffee) linger over the jokes and finny signs and slogans, the outrages and improprieties, more than the speeches and carefully coherent position papers. Andy convincing account of the politics of deliberation must take account of the creative potential that resides in the performance of debate.

#### “Shmita” is a practice in Jewish law where once every seven years, lands are left fallow and debts are forgiven—this is to acknowledge the tumult and ridiculous of the past seven years and to start anew. Vote AFF to engage in an ironic debate Shmita through Guerrilla Communication. Empirically, distorting the message and medium of communication are more effective than pure criticism at challenging and changing norms.

Blissett, Member of Communications Guerilla, 2001 [Luther, KOMMUNICATION GUERRILLA, <http://critica.com/critica2/kommun.html>]

Guerrilla communication doesn’t focus on arguments and facts like most leaflets, brochures, slogans or baneners. In its own way, it inhabits a militant political position, it is direct action in the space of social communication. But other than many militant positions (stone meets shop window), it doesn’t aim to destroy the codes of power and signs of control. It prefers to counteract[s] the omnipotent prattling of power by distorting and disfiguring the meanings. Communication guerrillas do not intend to occupy, interrupt or destroy the dominant channels of communications, they focus on detourning and subverting the messages of transported. But what’s new about all this? Nothing, really—after all, there have been the Berlin Dadaists, the Italian Indiani Metropolitiani, the Situationists and many others. The practice of communication guerrilla can even be traced back to legendary characters like the Hapsburgian soldier Svejk and Till Eulenspiegel, the wise fool. Standing on the shoulders of earlier avantgardes, communication guerilla doesn’t claim the invention of a new politics or the foundation of a new movement. It is merely continuing an incessant exploration of the jungle of communication processes, of the intertwined and muddled pathes of senders, codes and recipients. Looking not just at what’s being said but focusing on how it is being said is the method of this exploration. The aim is a practical, material critique of the very structures of communication as a basis of power and rule. The bourgeois system takes its strength—beyond other things—from its ability to incorporate critique. Any democratic government needs an opposition. Every opinion needs to be balanced with another one, since the concept of representative democracy relies on the fiction of equal exchange. Criticism which doesn’t fundamentally shatter the legitimacy of the ruling system tends to become part of it. Communication guerrilla is an attempt to intervene without getting absorbed by the dominant discourse. We are experimenting with ways to get involved in situations and at the same time to refuse any constructive participation. Power relations have a tendency to appear as normal, even natural and certainly inevitable. They are deeply inscribed into the rules of everyday life. Communication guerrilla is one of the ways to create those short and shimmering moments of confusion and distortion, moments which tell us that everything could be completely different: a fragmented utopia as a seed of change. The symbolic order of western capitalistic societies is built around discourses of rationality and rational conduct. Guerrilla communication relies on the powerful possibility of expressing a fundamental critique through the non-verbal, paradoxical and mythical.

#### Irony is Superior to all other forms of discourse and performance because of its ability to challenge and overcome deeply entrenched discourses and hierarchies.

Hutchenson, Prof of English @ University of Toronto, 1995, (Linda, Irony’s Edge, p. 29-30)

The opposite to the “conservative” view—in other words, the theory that irony is really subversive and oppositional—also has a long (and parallel) history in which satire’s deployment of it plays an important part as well. And, similarly, the range of evaluations of its function and efficacy can be seen in statements that run the gamut from enthusiastic endorsement to vituperative condemnation. This is what makes irony’s transideological politics so difficult to sort out. The subversive functioning of irony is often connected to the view that is a self-critical, self-knowing, self-reflexive mode (White 1973:37; B. Bennett 1993) that has the potential to offer a challenge to the hierarchy of the very “sites” of discourse, such an ability to undermine and overturn, is said to have “politically transformative power” (Stallybrass and White 1986: 201). The concept of irony as “counter-discourse” (Terdiman 1985) has become a mainstay of oppositional theories that take on such hierarchies—be they based on race, ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality…and the list could continue. A “mode of combat,” irony becomes “a negative passion, to displace and annihilate, a dominant depiction of the world” (Terdiman 1985: 12), a passion that is seen to be especially crucial when the dominant, established discourses show great “absorbtive capacity” (ibid.: 13). In this view, irony’s intimacy with the dominant discourses it contexts—it uses their very language as its said—is its strength, for it allows ironic discourse both to buy time (to be permitted and even listened to, even if not understood) and also to “relativize the [dominant’s] authority and stablilty” (Terdiman 1985: 15), in part by appropriating its power (Chambers 1991: xvi).

Their race args create a new form of authority which turns race solvency and a micro-totalitiarianism. Irony uniquely solves. GullibleGamber 15 explicates Zizek

http://www.reddit.com/r/philosophy/comments/32yhbp/slavoj\_%C5%BEi%C5%BEek\_political\_correctness\_is\_a\_more/

It's even worse than that. Zizek isn't saying you are ordered to want to go to your grandmother's house. He's saying you are told that a person who doesn't want to go to their grandmother's house is judged as a bad person. And you are then left to decide between a) changing your feelings about seeing your grandmother, b) accepting that you will be seen as a bad person or c) faking it. Most people choose to fake it. Ever told your boss at your shitty job that you're "happy to help" or that a project "sounds interesting?" This is rooted in Zizek's Lacanian perspective, in which the concept of the Big Other plays an important role. The Big Other is a complex idea, but basically Lacan's argument is that we all behave as if we are being watched all the time by an omnipresent entity. However, in the modern era, this entity isn't all-knowing like the traditional Judeo-Christian God. Instead, the Big Other is naive and fragile, like the symbolic "children" we all feel the need to protect through media censorship. We restrain our behavior in such a way as to preserve this innocence. Even worse, we all [and] pretend that the only things we know about each other are the things that this naive Big Other knows. If you don't see this clearly, imagine your uncle starts talking about jerking off at the Thanksgiving dinner table. Deep down, you know your uncle jerks off, so why would this be so strange to hear? Because he is violating the naivete of the Big Other, making clear that he (and, worse, maybe even you) loves jerking off. Now it isn't respectable, controlled citizens sitting around the table, but gross animalistic id-monsters. The psychic stress of thinking that the world sees us this way is too much to bear, so we avoid it all costs, and tend to punish people who cause this to happen. You can't make it known that you don't love visiting the elderly or doing data-entry because that means "people" don't love these things, which means the world isn't built on love and fulfilling labor. But Zizek argues that the basis of revolutionary change is in finding ways to overcome this prisoner's dilemma and actually violate these injunctions. To find ways to show that there are many more possibilities than we are normally aware of and that the consequences of these choices are actually less severe than remaining in the status quo. He talks about this as the authentic/emancipatory act. So Zizek is saying the whole trick to controlling a society is making everyone agree to pretend we don't see each other for what we really are and to make everyone agree there are big personal costs associated with breaking this rule. This is how the grandmother story connects to the obscene jokes and PC culture. Zizek is claiming that we need, sometimes, to reduce each other to our common, base natures in order to overcome contrived (racial/national) boundaries. This means seeing each other as gross, horrible, selfish beings. But he sees political correctness as as a tool of the Big Other, where nobody can feel comfortable taking this step, since they don't think people will be open to it.

# AT Irony Bad

## AT Irony ineffective

1. Empirically denied--Look to people like Stephen Colbert, Jonathan Swift, or really any stand-up comic, like George Carline. This empirically denies ineffectiveness.
2. TURN--A recent study found voters were more informed watching Colbert than Fox news
3. NUQ—current system isn’t effective either. People seriously hold that a $2 change in the minimum wage will cause the death of all humanity. We know it’s false, but we pretend like it’s true
4. The discursive value of the ironic deconstruction in the AC goes to remind the judge, competitors and the circuit of the ridiculousness. Debaters and judges love to share amusing stories, and this AC is one

## AT Labeling Irony not effective

1. Analytically denied—irony and self-awareness are two different, independent layers. The speech act of my AC is not affected by my labelling and explaining why it was necessary
2. Empirically denied—people like Colbert acknowledge that he just plays a character and his message isn’t weakened. A modest proposal by Swift had the first pages as satire then the rest explaining it.
3. TURN—If I didn’t label my AC as ironic, then I would have just seemed like an asshole for the entirety of the speech. Admittedly, I’m still an asshole now, just a different, more critical kind.
4. TURN—by labeling my AC as ironic, I gave the NC the change to operate within my ironic paradigm of ironic deoncstruction, which means the potential clash increases effectiveness. It’s your fault you didn’t want to engage me

## AT System doesn’t recognize Irony

1. TURN—it’s not the system I’m trying to change, but the way we the participants in the system see it. A perfect example of this is Stephen Colbert’s lampooning of George Bush during the Correspondent’s dinner. He loved it, but his real criticism worked for the constituents
2. This relies on Irony not being effective in the first place

## AT Be Ironic and Vote Neg

1. This isn’t ironic, this is dumb—there’s still a difference. My ironic deconstruction in the AC critically examines the trends in debate and flaws and foibles of debaters for a constructive end. Saying drop irony to be ironic is inane and counterproductive

## AT Wrong Forum

1. TURN--If I’m winning my role of the ballot, then it’s the perfect forum
2. TURN—there’s no better forum for investigatively fucking with debate than in a debate round. It wouldn’t make sense to do this at an Olive Garden, though to be fair, mostly why is because the servers would keep bothering me for tips. Which only reinforces why you need to affirm my plan text.
3. TURN—neg getting pissed off at my AC is a) what you’d expect from any legitimate kritik of the system as people don’t like change and do like to take the things they care for way too damn seriously AND b) shows the importance of the irony AC—I’m deconstructing why he’s getting pissed off in the first place
4. TURN—your mom’s the wrong forum

## AT No Weighing Mechanism

1. Not true, you can weigh by the significance of what we are lampooning, the probability of our cause being effected, the scope of people affected.

## AT People Don’t understand Irony

1. TURN—well, then how did you know to read that block… ironic, isn’t it?
2. TURN—people can misunderstand anything. For instance, JUDGE HE JUST CONCEDED YOU VOTE ON IRONY BY MAKING THAT ARGUMENT!!1!
3. No-abuse—you understood irony in this round. Call for the advocacy text—it’s unique to this round. I am not necessarily advocating irony to be used in every round, just as part of this Shmita
4. No abuse—I literally call out my AC as being ironic. Plus it’s called
5. No abuse—your authors are talking about people not understanding irony over text…but my performance was delivered with tone and signals that convey irony. It means anyone could understand.
6. TURN—by trying to construe some huge impact to the irony AC you are biting into the ROTB because the offense comes from my discursive speech act of insignificance

## AT Switch-side bad for irony

1. TURN—making you argue against irony means we can have a better understanding of irony in the first place
2. No Abuse—you didn’t have to argue against irony, you could have read an Ironic NC strat and won there
3. TURN—even if arguing against irony was bad, switch-side debate is particularly important because debate is one of the few places where debaters can learn the value of both sides of an issue without having to commit themselves to the “wrong” one. This is crucial to the development of debaters as open minded and critical thinkers.

Muir 1993 (Star A. , Professor of Communications @ George Mason University,PHILOSOPHY AND RHETORIC, "A Defense of the Ethics of Contemporary Debate," v26, n4, p.290)

The role of switch-side debate is especially important in the oral defense of arguments that foster tolerance without accruing the moral complications of acting on such beliefs. The forum is therefore unique in providing debaters with attitudes of tolerance without committing them to active moral irresponsibility. As Freeley notes, debaters are indeed exposed to a multivalued world, both within and between the sides of a given topic. Yet this exposure hardly commits them to such “mistaken” values. In this view, the divorce of the game from the “real world” [this] can be seen as a means of gaining perspective without obligating students to validate their hypothetical value structure through immoral actions. Values clarification, Stewart is correct in pointing out, does not mean that no values are developed. Two very important values—tolerance and fairness—inhere to a significant degree in the ethics of switch-side debate. A second point about the charge of relativism is that tolerance is related to the development of reasoned moral viewpoints. The willingness to recognize the existence of other views, and to grant alternative positions a degree of credibility, is a value fostered by switch-side debate: Alternately debating both sides of the same question . . . inculcates a deep-seated attitude of tolerance toward differing points of view. To be forced to debate only one side leads to an ego-identificaion with that side. , . . The other side in contrast is seen only as something to be discredited. Arguing as persuasively as one can for completely opposing views is one way of giving recognition to the idea that a strong case can generally be made for the views of earnest and intelligent men, however such views may clash with one’s own. . . .Promoting this kind of tolerance is perhaps one of the greatest benefits debating both sides has to offer. The activity should encourage debating both sides of a topic, rea- sons Thompson, because debaters are "more likely to realize that propositions are bilateral. It is those who fail to recognize this fact who become intolerant, dogmatic, and bigoted.""\* While Theo- dore Roosevelt can hardly be said to be advocating bigotry, his efforts to turn out advocates convinced of their rightness is not a position imbued with tolerance. At a societal level, the value of tolerance is more conducive to a fair and open assessment of competing ideas.

This turns all their internal links to real world advocacy, without first adopting both sides of the issue in a harmless forum such as debate, debaters go onto the real world without the ability to critically access and defend their position. In other words, debate is the metaphysical playground where children learn to make mistakes so that they don't make those same mistakes when the stakes are higher.

1. TURN--<Opponent> I really valued your opinion, and thought you’d engage in the struggle with me

## AT Mocking Serious Issues Bad

1. TURN—it’s worse to recognize that serious issues are bad and just not speak of them. That’s what allows them to continue
2. TURN--I’m just the bearer of bad news—don’t shoot the messenger. Satire’s role is to galvanize anger at a misdirected source so we can refocus it on the issues that matter
3. No abuse—I’m not even trivializing poverty—I’m just charading the significance we pretend to have in debate. I literally say that
4. Okay maybe I’m trivializing extinction. But hey, Bostrom means that’s a good thing. HAIL BOSTROM <salute>

## AT People Like Debate, Not Irony

1. No impact—who gives a shit?
2. TURN—they need to lighten up… or realize that I’m not mocking them, but the system
3. TURN—you really don’t get the point of this role of the ballot, do you? You’re still clearly trying to make some significant conclusion

## AT Why This Round

1. I don’t need to justify why this round—just demonstrate debate’s significance absurdity
2. C/A Hutchenson—this round is uniquely key because irony gains its discursive and oppositional power by acting in the dominant space being criticized. This round is an example of just that
3. Out-of-round not as effective because nobody cares out of round. It’s not mocking anything sacred, and not the purpose of satire. Swift didn’t present “A Modest Proposal” to Pakastani people

## AT You’re just trying to win

1. WHAT THE HELL! How do you know my advocacy!!? You are being presumptuous and rude—I advise you check yourself good sir/ma’am! You don’t know what’s going on in my head. In fact, I swear, I was thinking about puppies.
2. TURN—even if I am doing this just to win… you just made that argument to try to win!
3. No abuse--Even if I am trying to win, that doesn’t nullify the critical advantages of my AC

## AT Cooptation

1. TURN—if those I’m criticizing latched onto my plan without evne a trace of irony, it’d expose and shed light on the ridiculousness
2. Non-unique—many people in the status quo already really advocate the plan
3. TURN—I’m the one coopting them! My re-approriation of their voices in a mocking manner is the offense!

## AT Ironic NCs

1. You’re only copying my ironic stance! That’s not cool! It’s like when you hear Louis CK say a hilarious joke and then Dane Cook goes and steals it but it’s just not as funny because a) it doesn’t have the same presentational value b) it doesn’t have its originality or surprise novelty and c) Dane Cook is a doucher for stealing jokes!!
2. TURN—AC is better for irony than the negative, four points
   1. Absurdity doesn’t equal irony. Kulyncyh from the role of the ballot clearly shows that irony is actually disempowering unless it recognizes and hints at the irony of the situation—the plan did, the neg didn’t
   2. The NC had no discursive markers to show their audience they were being ironic or satirical…when irony becomes obscure it risks literal interpreatations
   3. They have no underview to explain the significance of their irony…plan did, Neg didn’t!
   4. They don’t have an actual extinction scenario people have read. Advantage one was literally from someone’s wiki…plan always outweighs because I have actual examples from people I criticize
3. TURN—all the NC does is steal focus away from the intent of the performance of the AC. Vote aff because my message was clearer
4. Perm—Ironically do the plan and CP
5. Perm—textual competition is an absurd check of competition for irony debates. Little a is that text doesn’t correspond with the advocacy when you say the opposite. Little b is that their intent is consistent with my intent because \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_, so it’s not mutually exclusive

## AT Theory

Overview—1. His failure to present an alternate role of the ballot is damning, cross apply my role of the ballot of using irony to deconstruct debate, that’s Klynych—this means there’s always a risk of offense for me, where he has none. 2. His arguments boil down to this round not being key, but he’s conceding the warrant in Hutchenson—this round is key because irony has a unique ability to overcome entrenches modalities and politics without being absorbed by the dominant discourses. The impact is K before theory because only I have solvency for the conceded harms of the squo

### AT Topic Ed

1. Non-unique—we can get topic ed just by researching, reading a book, or taking classes in college. Even if he wins that we need in-round discussion, there’s no reason that we need this round too
2. TURN—C/A Hutchenson, that means this round has reason not to be topical but use irony
3. No abuse and TURN—my performance just encourages us for a round to be insignificant—means I still have a topical advocacy of paying waiters more so they don’t have to work for tips—I may have different warrants behind it, but ultimately it’s topical. This is better for topic ed because we get more interesting and underexplored regions of the lit we wouldn’t otherwise cover—means my world coopts his and is comparatively better
4. No abuse—extend my advocacy that you vote aff for an ironic debate shmita—even if he wins it’s bad to do irony every round, it’s not competitive with my advocacy because I say we should do it for this round, regardless of other rounds
5. Outweighed—at best neg’s winning a marginal link to topic ed, but he’s conceded full strength of link of the warrants on my K. Means even if theory before K in a vacuum, I control a larger impact still

## AT Ks

1. Their Net Benefit to the K is coopted—Kulynch and Blisset straight turns their K because straight forward Ks don’t solve but only get incorporated within the dominant political machine
2. Irony solves for any K--it allows us to question the status quo and solve. Especially relevant because my AC criticizes the notion of our self-holding significance in the first place

Burbules 01[ Nicholas C. Burbules. University of Illinois at UrbanaChampaign. “Postmodern Doubt and Philosophy of Education.” June, 01]

Education involves engagement, among persons and between persons and the matters to be explored. Yet for this engagement to avoid dependency, there must also be a critical distance. Playing with the tropes of irony, tragedy, and parody are among the ways that we can avoid taking ourselves as teachers too seriously. We can adopt certain stances without fully endorsing them. We can question our authority, and invite others to question it, even within contexts that arrogate authority to us whether we wish it or not. 20 At a deeper level, we can adopt methods of inquiry and interrogation but also turn these methods upon themselves, exploring their usefulness andthe limits of their usefulness. Such a stance allows for both a respect and appreciation for perspectives and approaches that broaden our understandings, but also a wary suspicion of the tendency for teachers, texts, and methods to become hypostasized, entrenched.